



Historic District Commission

Meeting Minutes

March 10, 2026, 6:30 PM

RM 110 | Council Chamber

Chair Don Tise
Vice-Chair Brian Daniels
Glenn Connolly

Josh Gurlitz
Nancy McCormick
Laura Moore

For interpretation
or translation
services, call
919-969-5105.

ဘာသာပြန်ဆိုခြင်းနှင့်
စကားပြန်ခြင်းအတွက်၊
(၉၁၉) ၉၆၉ ၅၁၀၅
ကိုဖုန်းခေါ်ပါ။

如需口头或书面翻
译服务，请拨打
919-969-5105。

လၢတၢ်ကတိကျိးထံ မ့တ
မ့ၢ် လၢတၢ်ကွဲးကျိးထံအ
တၢ်မၤစၢၤအဂီၢ် ကိးဘၣ်
၉၁၉-၉၆၉ ၅၁၀၅

Para servicios de
interpretación o
traducción, llame al
919 969-5105.

Opening

Roll Call

Charnika Harrell, Staff Liaison, Anna Scott Myers, Staff Liaison, Kevin Hornik,
Counsel to the Commission

Present

6 - Chair Don Tise, Vice-Chair Brian Daniels , Glenn
Connolly, Josh Gurlitz, Nancy McCormick, and Laura
Moore

Women's History Month acknowledgement

Secretary reads procedures into the record

Commission Chair reads public charge

Approval of Agenda

Vice Chair Daniels moved, Moore seconded, to approve the agenda.

The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Aye:

6 - Chair Don Tise, Vice-Chair Brian Daniels , Glenn Connolly,
Josh Gurlitz, Nancy McCormick, and Laura Moore

Announcements

**Staff liaison Anna Scott Myers asked commissioners to think about
their availability for a retreat.**

Petitions

Approval of Minutes

1. [February 10, 2026 Meeting Minutes](#)

[26-0047]

Commissioner Gurlitz moved, Connolly seconded, to approve the minutes for the meeting on February 10, 2026. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Information

2. [Administrative COA Approvals and Maintenance Work Report](#) [26-0048]

Consent

3. [304 N. Boundary Street](#) [26-0049]

Vice Chair Daniels moved, Gurlitz seconded, to approve the written decision for 304 N. Boundary Street. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Aye: 6 - Chair Don Tise, Vice-Chair Brian Daniels , Glenn Connolly, Josh Gurlitz, Nancy McCormick, and Laura Moore

New Business

4. [308 W. Cameron Avenue](#) [26-0050]

Counsel Hornik advised the commission to determine whether any individuals present would like to participate in the hearing as a party with standing. Hornik also explained what participating as a party meant for evidentiary hearings and the types of special damages the commission should consider when determining if an individual has standing.

Commissioner McCormick asked if a party with standing could provide comments about their personal knowledge of the character of the district. Hornik explained that speakers could provide knowledge about the character of the district based on their personal opinion without having standing.

Donald McIver Stanford Jr., an owner of the abutting property at 129 Mallette Street, requested to participate as a party with standing. Mr. Stanford said the subject property is uphill from his property, so his property would be impacted if a tree fell or plumbing failed on the subject property. He said the value of his property would be impacted. He also said that the proposed house would cast a shadow onto his property because it would be larger than the existing house. He said the additional impervious surface on the subject property would cause more runoff onto his property. He said he would have to look at the

new house every day and the proposed parking area would be near his property. He also said that he did not receive the mailed notice until the Friday before the meeting.

Chair Tise asked Counsel Hornik if the application needed to be reviewed by another board. Hornik said it would not.

Jay Fulkerson, architect and applicant, said the application would meet the Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO). He also clarified that zoning approval would be determined later. He questioned whether someone could suffer special damages if a project met the LUMO.

Staff liaisons Anna Scott Myers and Charnika Harrell clarified notice requirements and when the sign was posted on the subject property and postcards were mailed.

Vice Chair Daniels said he thought Mr. Stanford has standing because of the size and height of the new house. Commissioner Gurlitz was unsure if they could consider property value impacts if Mr. Stanford did not receive the notice in time to engage a licensed professional. Hornik clarified that the commission did not need expert opinion testimony about property values to determine standing. He said the commission could rely on lay testimony about property value impacts.

Tise said the items Mr. Stanford mentioned related to the LUMO and not the Design Standards.

Vice Chair Daniels moved, Gurlitz seconded, to approve Mr. Stanford's request for standing. The motion was amended to also approve Donna Bryant's, spouse of Mr. Stanford and owner of 129 Mallette Street, request for standing. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Stanford asked the commission to hear the application and continue it to the May meeting because they could not attend the April meeting. Tise said he preferred not to push the decision back. Other commissioners wanted to hear the applicant's presentation.

Fulkerson said the owners of the subject property were interested in improving the existing house and building a new house. Fulkerson explained the use of the property would be a

detached duplex and that the project was within the allowed floor area limit. He said the existing house faced Cameron and the new house would face Mallette.

Fulkerson presented a map of the properties. He said that the house next to Mr. Stanford's property was closer than the proposed house on the subject property would be. He said the new house would be 1.5 stories and presented photos of other houses. He explained that Mallette has a diverse mix of houses ranging from one-story, 1.5-stories, and 2-2.5 stories.

Fulkerson said most of the site was impervious. He said the proposed house was located near an existing curb cut. He also said the new house was placed as close as it could be to the existing house. He also said the project would remove impervious surface, and the proposed parking area would be a buffer between the two properties. Fulkerson discussed the scale and materials of other properties on Mallette Street.

Fulkerson described the proposed changes to the existing house, including removing a previous addition and replacing it with stairs, replacing the roofing and siding materials, and replacing windows. He described the new house and presented elevations. He explained that the new house would have a front porch with a metal roof and a dormer on the side of the house that faces the rear of the existing house. He presented an elevation that showed the new house in relation to the house on 129 Mallette Street. He said he did not think the new house would cast a shadow beyond the rear property line.

Fulkerson explained the property would be graded to keep the floor of the new house as low as possible. He said the elevation showed the house at a higher grade than what they hoped to accomplish. He also discussed materials for the proposed house.

Fulkerson described the proposed site work and parking area. He presented photos of the existing concrete retaining wall from Mallette Street. He also said there was an existing aluminum fence on Cameron that extended onto Mallette. He said they planned to keep the existing walls and repair them. He presented the site plan and explained the parking areas.

Fulkerson presented a rendering of a view of the properties from Mallette Street. The rendering showed the existing and

proposed houses on the subject property and the house on 129 Mallette Street.

Mr. Stanford asked to look at the retaining wall. He said the wall was cinder brick and in terrible condition. He asked the applicant if they could make it more congruent with the district. Mr. Stanford said he thought one of the reasons the property was not contributing was because of the walls. Fulkerson said he would not discount any potential changes to the walls and that the house was not contributing because of its age. Mr. Stanford asked if they considered replacing the fence with a stone wall or metal fencing that would be consistent within the district. Fulkerson said he would need to talk with his client.

Daniels asked the applicant if they wanted to continue the application. Fulkerson declined.

Dr. Bryant presented photos. She said understanding the proposed height difference was missing. She said the distance between the existing house and the proposed house was unlike any other house on the street. She said that a house built on the retaining wall would look like a three-story house and it would ruin the character of the street. Fulkerson clarified that the retaining wall would be removed to get the floor of the new house as low as possible.

Mr. Stanford explained that Mallette used to be for families, and that there were currently only five homeowners. He explained that Mallette was an old street. He said the goal of the standards was preservation. He also said the new house would be for students. He also said he thinks the new house is out of scale because it would be bigger than the existing house.

Daniels asked the applicant if he would like to continue the hearing because the applicant had mentioned being open to some ideas. Fulkerson declined and said he thought the project met the standards.

Romulo Colindres, son of the subject property owner, was sworn in. Colindres agreed with the architect about the application meeting the standards.

McCormick asked about the grading and height. Fulkerson explained that the renderings showed the existing retaining

wall, but they hope to bring the grade down.

The hearing was paused to address the two remaining new business items for 208 Glandon Street and 209 N. Boundary Street. The applicants consented to continuing the applications to the next meeting. Vice Chair Daniels moved, seconded by Tise, to continue the applications for 208 Glandon Street and 209 N. Boundary Street to the April 14th meeting. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

The hearing for 308 W. Cameron Avenue continued.

Elizabeth Sasser, owner of 403 W. Cameron Avenue, commented on the application. She said 308 W. Cameron Avenue has been a nuisance. She said that doubling the number of occupants on the property is hard to bear. She objected to the number of parking spaces and did not think the new house would be maintained.

The commission discussed the proposed parking area for the new house, the scale of the new house, and the distance between the existing and new house. The commission expressed a need for more information from the applicant.

Vice Chair Daniels moved, seconded by Moore, to continue the evidentiary hearing to a special meeting on April 30th and that commissioners would provide comments to staff by March 17th to share with the applicant ahead of the special meeting. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Aye: 6 - Chair Don Tise, Vice-Chair Brian Daniels , Glenn Connolly, Josh Gurlitz, Nancy McCormick, and Laura Moore

5. 208 Glandon Drive

[26-0051]

The applicants consented to continuing the applications to the next meeting. Vice Chair Daniels moved, seconded by Tise, to continue the applications for 208 Glandon Street and 209 N. Boundary Street to the April 14th meeting. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Aye: 6 - Chair Don Tise, Vice-Chair Brian Daniels , Glenn Connolly, Josh Gurlitz, Nancy McCormick, and Laura Moore

6. 209 N. Boundary Street

[26-0052]

Discussion

7. Design Standards **[26-0053]**

The commission did not discuss this item.

8. Education and Outreach **[26-0054]**

The commission did not discuss this item.

Adjournment

Next Meeting - April 14, 2026

Order of Consideration of Agenda Items:

- 1. Staff Presentation*
- 2. Applicant's Presentation*
- 3. Public Comment*
- 4. Board Discussion*
- 5. Motion*
- 6. Restatement of Motion by Chair*
- 7. Vote*
- 8. Announcement of Vote by Chair*

Public Charge: The Advisory Body pledges its respect to the public. The Body asks the public to conduct themselves in a respectful, courteous manner, both with the Body and with fellow members of the public. Should any member of the Body or any member of the public fail to observe this charge at any time, the Chair will ask the offending person to leave the meeting until that individual regains personal control. Should decorum fail to be restored, the Chair will recess the meeting until a genuine commitment to this public charge is observed.

Unless otherwise noted, please contact the Planning Department at 919-968-2728; planning@townofchapelhill.org for more information on the above referenced applications.

See the Advisory Boards page <http://www.townofchapelhill.org/boards> for background information on this Board.